

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

KEVIN DARRELL FINGER, )  
                            )  
Plaintiff,               )  
                            )  
v.                         )                          No. 4:09-CV-168 DDN  
                            )  
KEITH SCHAFER, et al., )  
                            )  
Defendants.             )

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon the motion of Kevin Darrell Finger for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Upon consideration of the financial information provided with the motion, the Court finds that plaintiff is financially unable to pay any portion of the filing fee. As a result, plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Additionally, the Court has reviewed the complaint and will dismiss it pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

**28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis in either law or in fact.” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1974 (2007).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

### **Discussion**

Plaintiff, a civilly-committed resident of the Missouri Sexual Offender Treatment Center ("MSOTC"), seeks monetary relief in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against Keith Schafer, Albert J. Fults, Jan Heckemeyer, Gary Stolzer, and Alan Blake. Plaintiff alleges that, in violation of Missouri law and a state court's order, he was transferred to a county jail for 158 days.

Having carefully considered plaintiff's claims, the Court concludes that the instant action is legally frivolous. Plaintiff's allegations simply do not rise to the level of a constitutional deprivation and are legally insufficient to establish a denial of rights secured under the Constitution or laws of the United States. See Bagley v. Rogerson, 5 F.3d 325 (8th Cir. 1993) (allegation of state law violation, statutory or decisional, does not, in itself, state claim under federal Constitution or § 1983). Moreover, Missouri Revised Statute § 632.489.1 specifically authorizes the transfer of a sexually violent predator "to an appropriate secure facility, including, but not limited to, a county jail." Last, plaintiff's conclusory allegations that his confinement in the county jail was punitive or otherwise violative of his constitutional rights fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is **GRANTED**. [Doc. 2]

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is legally frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or both.

An appropriate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.



---

**CHARLES A. SHAW  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Dated this 12th day of February, 2009.